

Appl. No. : 10/824,797  
Filed : April 15, 2004

### **REMARKS**

The Claim amendments in the Response filed April 25, 2006 were not entered. Accordingly, claim amendments submitted herein reflect changes to the claims that were pending as of October 25, 2005.

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 are canceled herein without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in this or any other patent application.

Claim 9 is amended to independent form. Support the amendment can be found in original Claims 1 and 9. Claim 9 has been amended to recite an additional step. Support for this amendment can be found in original Claims 4 and 9. No new matter is added by this amendment.

New Claims 18-29 are submitted herewith. Support for these new claims is found in the claims as originally filed and throughout the specification, for example, at the paragraph beginning at page 10, line 7, the paragraph beginning at page 6, line 5, and the paragraph beginning at page 6, line 7. No new matter is added by these new claims.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendments, Claims 9 and 18-29 will be pending.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over US 6,965,418 (Hara).

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 10-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 10-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over US 6,914,139 (Mukunoki).

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

**Appl. No.** : 10/824,797  
**Filed** : April 15, 2004

Rejection of Claims 4, 5 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of US 5,880,800 (Mikura).

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

Rejection of Claims 9 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of US 5,391,472 (Muys).

Applicant respectively traverses this rejection.

Claim 17 has been canceled, and, thus, the rejection of this claim is now moot.

Claim 9, as amended, is directed to a method for manufacturing an antistatic optical film comprising an antistatic layer at least one side of an optical film, comprising the steps of: applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer on an optical film; drying to form the antistatic layer; and applying a pressure sensitive adhesive layer on another side of the antistatic layer.

Applicants submit that no combination of Mukunoki or Muys teaches or suggests an antistatic optical film comprising an optical film and an antistatic layer, where a pressure sensitive adhesive layer is laminated on another side of a surface having the optical film of the antistatic layer, as previously recited in now canceled Claim 4. This is consistent with the Office Action, which has not rejected Claim 4 as obvious over Mukunoki in view of Muys. Accordingly, in view of the amendment to the claims, Claim 9 is not obvious over Mukunoki in view of Muys.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Mukunoki and Muys, alone or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed method because these references do not teach or suggest the result obtained by the Applicants by performing the claimed process, which includes applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer on the an optical film. The present invention uses a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer as a formation material of an antistatic layer, which enables utilization of an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion including water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymers in formation of the antistatic layer, and does not require utilization of non-aqueous organic solvents. This can make formation of antistatic layer easier, without causing change in quality and

**Appl. No.** : 10/824,797  
**Filed** : April 15, 2004

deterioration of the optical films even in the case where the antistatic layer is formed on optical films such as polarizing plate that are soluble in non-aqueous organic solvent and have inferior organic solvent resistance. Moreover, use of the water soluble or the water dispersible conductive polymer enables adoption of applying methods such as a coating method, a dipping method and a spraying method, and also enables reduction of manufacturing cost as compared with methods such as a vacuum deposition method and a sputtering method, and improvement in productivity may be realized. These results are further demonstrated in the Examples and Comparative Examples provided at pages 41-43 of the specification.

In view of the amendments to Claim 9 and the above remarks, Applicants submit that Claim 9 is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of Claim 9.

#### New Claims

All new claims depend ultimately from Claim 9. Thus, at least for the reasons provided above, the new claims also are non-obvious over the cited references.

#### Rejection of Claims 4, 5 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of US 6,310,133 (Katashima).

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

#### Rejection under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 of Hara.

This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the

**Appl. No.** : **10/824,797**  
**Filed** : **April 15, 2004**

application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 23, 2006

By: 

Kerry Taylor  
Registration No. 43,947  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

2699254  
062006